UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,187	02/13/2004	Michael Timmons	SYB/0094.01	2186

31779   7590   05/31/2007
JOHN A. SMART
708 BLOSSOM HILL RD., #201
LOS GATOS, CA 95032-3503

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/708,187	TIMMONS, MICHAEL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly Lovel	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 March 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 13-59</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 13-59</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-11 and 13-59 are rejected. Claim 12 is cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11

March 2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

3.   The objection to claim 50 is withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 of claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-41 and 59 as directed

to non-statutory subject matter are withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-4, 9, 13, 14, 17-25, 30, 33-35, 38-44, 48, 51, 52, and 54-59 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub

2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al (hereafter Jerrard-Dunne) in view of US

PGPub 2005/017015 to Ramaswamy et al (hereafter Ramaswamy).

Referring to claim 1, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a method for interactive content

retrieval and display at a computer [user system 26] connected to a network [network

30] and having Internet access (see Fig 1 and [0020]), the method comprising:

providing a plurality of portlets [for example, portlets 48 A-E] selected by a user

[user 32 or portlet developer] from a plurality of sources [content provider system 28]

available via the Internet for retrieval of content for display (see [0026], lines 8-14;

[0030]; [0036], lines 1-7) in a user interface of the computer [user system 26];

in response to user input, mapping a message action to a first portlet to create a

messaging portlet [the developer links desired fields together using a user interface]

(see [0031]) for sending a message to a registrar [broker system 42] in response to user

interaction with the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0036]-[0037] – when data is

entered in the input field of the source portlet, the data is sent to the broker system);

creating a listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a second portlet [e.g. weather] selected by the user [developer] with the registrar [broker system 42] to receive messages from the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0032] and [0037], lines 6-10);

in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet [a user 32 interacts with portlet data sharing system 10 through user system 26] (see [0025], lines 1-2 and [0036], lines 1-7), retrieving particular content for display in the user interface [content is displayed in the portal page] (see [0028]) based on the message received by the listener portlet [destination portlet] from the messaging portlet [source portlet] (see [0033], lines 22-25; [0036]; and [0037]); and

displaying the particular content in the user interface [content is displayed in the portal page] (see [0028]).

However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein in response to user input at the computer, defining a particular message action to be taken in response to a user interaction with a first portlet, mapping the particular message action to the first portlet to create a messaging portlet for sending a message to a registrar in response to user interaction with the messaging portlet; wherein said registrar is located in a browser at the computer. Ramaswamy discloses a method, computer program product and apparatus allowing an end-user or administrator to couple portlets in a portal through user interface events taking place on the portal display itself (see abstract), including the further limitation of in response to user input at

the computer, defining a particular message action to be taken in response to a user

interaction with a first portlet, mapping the particular message action to the first portlet

to create a messaging portlet for sending a message to a registrar in response to user

interaction with the messaging portlet (see [0040]); wherein said registrar is located in a

browser at the computer [client-side scripting] (see Fig 7 and Fig 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the features of the tool for coupling portlets disclosed by

Ramaswamy with the tool of Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so

in order to decrease the bandwidth required populate the portals.

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Jerrard-Dunne and Ramaswamy

(hereafter Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy) discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said

plurality of portlets comprise a portal [portal page 46 comprises of portlets 48A, 48B,

48C, 48D and 48E] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0028], lines 1-11 and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 3, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of claim

1, wherein a portlet retrieves content selected by the user and extracted from a

particular source [another portlet or a content provider system] (Jerrard-Dunne: see

[0019], lines 4-8 and [0029], lines 6-13).

Referring to claim 4, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of claim

1, wherein a portlet displays content in a Web page [portal page] (Jerrard-Dunne: see

[0028] and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 9, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of claim

1, wherein said user interface comprises a browser interface (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0020]

– the user system 26 represents any type of computerized system that can be used to

access the world wide web; therefore the interface of the user system is considered to

represent a browser interface).

Referring to claim 13, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 1, wherein said registrar [mapping system] located in a browser window at the

computer passes messages from the messaging portlet to the listener portlet without

requiring communication with a remote computer [graphical user interface] (Jerrard-

Dunne: see [0031], lines 1-11 and [0032], lines 1-3; Ramaswamy: see [0043] – client-

side scripting code).

Referring to claim 14, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 13, wherein the browser window comprises a topmost browser window of a Web

page (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031]-[0032] – since the mapping occurs before the

interaction of the portlets can take place, the graphical user interface used for mapping

is considered to be the topmost browser).

Referring to claim 17, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 1, wherein the message received from said messaging portlet comprises a

selected one of an identifier, text [i.e., city of departure], or an attribute (Jerrard-Dunne:

see [0036] and [0037], lines 1-10).

Referring to claim 18, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

creating a second listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a third portlet [i.e., Hotel; i.e., Weather could be the first listener] selected by the user with the registrar to receive messages from said messaging portlet [i.e., Airline Reservation] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031]-[0032] and Fig 3B); and

in response to user interaction with said messaging portlet [source portlet], retrieving particular content for display in the user interface based on the message received by the second listener portlet [destination portlet] from the messaging portlet (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0037], lines 1-10).

Referring to claim 19, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

mapping a message action to the listener portlet [destination portlet] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031]-[0032]);

creating a second listener portlet [destination portlet] by registering a third portlet [i.e., Car Rental; i.e., Hotel could be the first listener] selected by the user with the registrar to listen for messages from the listener portlet [Hotel] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031]-[0032] and Fig 3B); and

in response to the message received by the listener portlet from the messaging portlet [source portlet], retrieving particular content for display in the user interface

based on the message received by the second listener portlet from the listener portlet (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0037]).

Referring to claim 20, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a computer-readable medium having processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0010]).

Referring to claim 21, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: downloading set of processor-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0010]; [0022]; and [0035]).

Referring to claim 22, Jerrard-Dunne discloses a system for interactive content retrieval and display at a computer [user system 26] connected to a network [network 30] access and having Internet access (see Fig 1 and [0020]), the system comprising:

a user interface [input/output interface 18] for display of content at the computer (see [0020 and [0023]);

an actioner module [source portlet – portlets include a portlet program that includes the program code for obtaining the content displayed in the visual portlet (see [0019], lines 7-8)] for display of content selected by a user from a plurality of sources [content provider system 28] available via the internet in the user interface (see [0026], lines 8-14; [0030]; [0036], lines 1-7) and sending a message based on user interaction with said actioner module (see [0036]-[0037] – when data is entered in the input field of the source portlet, the data is sent to the broker system);

a registrar [broker system 42] for receiving the message from said actioner

module [source portlet] and routing the message to at least one listener module

[destination portlet] registered to receive the message (see [0037], lines 1-10); and

at least one listener module [destination portlet] selected by the user registered

for receiving the message from the registrar [broker system 42] (see [0032] and [0037],

lines 6-10) and retrieving and displaying content in the user interface based on the

message sent by the actioner module [source portlet] (see [0033], lines 22-25; [0036];

and [0037]).

However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations of a

wizard module at the computer for a user to create an actioner module by defining a

message action and associating the message action with content selected by the user

from a plurality of sources available via the Internet and wherein said registrar is located

in a browser at the computer. Ramaswamy discloses a method, computer program

product and apparatus allowing an end-user or administrator to couple portlets in a

portal through user interface events taking place on the portal display itself (see

abstract), including the further limitations of a wizard module at the computer for a user

to create an actioner module by defining a message action and associating the

message action with content selected by the user from a plurality of sources available

via the Internet (see Fig 3; Fig 7; and [0040]) and wherein said registrar is located in a

browser at the computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the features of the tool for coupling portlets disclosed by

Ramaswamy with the tool of Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so

in order to decrease the bandwidth required populate the portals.

Referring to claim 23, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 22, wherein said actioner module [source portlet] comprises a portlet (Jerrard-

Dunne: see [0019], lines 7-8 and [0028]).

Referring to claim 24, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 23, wherein said portlet retrieves and extracts content from a particular source

[another portlet or a content provider system] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0019], lines 4-8 and

[0029], lines 6-13).

Referring to claim 25, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 22, wherein at least one listener module [destination portlet] displays content in a

Web page [portal page] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0028] and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 30, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 22, wherein said user interface comprises a browser interface (Jerrard-Dunne:

see [0020] – the user system 26 represents any type of computerized system that can

be used to access the world wide web; therefore the interface of the user system is

considered to represent a browser interface).

Referring to claim 33, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 22, wherein said at least one listener module [destination portlet] registers with the

registrar to receive the message from the actioner module [source portlet] (Jerrard-

Dunne: see [0031]-[0032] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 34, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 33, wherein the registrar [mapping system] is located in a browser window

[graphical user interface] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031], lines 1-11 and [0032], lines 1-3;

and Ramaswamy: see [0043] – client-side scripting code).

Referring to claim 35, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 34, wherein the browser window comprises a topmost browser window of a Web

page (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031]-[0032] – since the mapping occurs before the

interaction of the portlets can take place, the graphical user interface used for mapping

is considered to be the topmost browser).

Referring to claim 38, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 22, wherein the message received by said at least one listener module

[destination portlet] comprises a selected one of an identifier [identification of the

destination field], text, or an attribute (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0037], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 39, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of

claim 22, wherein the wizard module enables a user to select from a plurality of

message actions in creating the actioner module (Ramaswamy: see Fi3 and Fig 7).

Referring to claim 40, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of claim 22, further comprising: a listener messaging module [destination portlet: i.e., Hotel portlet receives city] registered to receive the message from the actioner module [source portlet: i.e., Airline Reservation portlet sends destination city] and send a message based on the message received from the actioner module [Hotel portlet now sends the city to Car Rental portlet] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 41, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the system of claim 40, wherein said listener messaging module retrieves content for display in the user interface based on the message sent by the actioner module (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0036]-[0037]).

Referring to claim 42, Jerrard-Dunne discloses in a computer [user system 26] connected to a network [network 30] and having Internet access, a method for collaborative retrieval and display of information in a Web page (see Fig 1 and [0020]), the method comprising:

retrieving [obtaining] (see [0026], lines 9-13) a plurality of elements [portlets] selected by a user [user 32 or portlet developer] from a plurality of sources [content provider system 28] available via the Internet for display of information in a Web page [portal page] (see [0030] and [0036], lines 1-7);

creating a registrar [broker system 42] for receiving a message and routing the message to at least one listener element [destination portlet] registered to receive the message (see [0031] and [0037], lines 1-12);

associating a message action [mapping] specified by the user with a first element

[source portlet] for sending a message in response to user interaction with the first

element [source portlet] (see [0031] and [0037], lines 1-12);

registering at least one listener element [destination portlet] selected by the user

with the registrar for receiving a message sent by the first element [source portlet] (see

[0031]); and

in response to user interaction with the first element [source portlet], displaying

particular information on the Web page based on the message received by said at least

one listener element [destination portlet] from the first element [source portlet] (see

[0037], lines 1-12).

However, Jerrard-Dunne fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein

said registrar is located in a browser at the computer. Ramaswamy discloses a method,

computer program product and apparatus allowing an end-user or administrator to

couple portlets in a portal through user interface events taking place on the portal

display itself (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said registrar is

located in a browser at the computer [client-side scripting] (see Fig 7 and Fig 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the features of the tool for coupling portlets disclosed by

Ramaswamy with the tool of Jerrard-Dunne. One would have been motivated to do so

in order to decrease the bandwidth required populate the portals.

Referring to claim 43, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein said plurality of elements [portlets] comprise a portal [portal page 46

comprises of portlets 48A, 48B, 48C, 48D and 48E] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0028], lines 1-

11 and Fig 2).

Referring to claim 44, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein an element [portlet] retrieves and extracts information from a

particular source [another portlet or a content provider system] (Jerrard-Dunne: see

[0019], lines 4-8 and [0029], lines 6-13).

Referring to claim 48, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein said Web page [portal page] is displayed by a Web browser (Jerrard-

Dunne: see [0020] – the user system 26 represents any type of computerized system

that can be used to access the world wide web; therefore the interface of the user

system is considered to represent a browser interface).

`Referring to claim 51`, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein said displaying step includes displaying particular content based on

the message received by the listener element; wherein the message is received by the

listener element from the first element without requiring communication with a remote

computer [client-side scripting] (Ramaswamy: see [0043]).

Referring to claim 52, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 51, wherein the browser window comprises a topmost browser window of a Web

page (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031]-[0032] – since the mapping occurs before the

interaction of the portlets can take place, the graphical user interface used for mapping

is considered to be the topmost browser).

Referring to claim 54, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein the message received by said at least one listener element

[destination portlet] comprises a selected one of an identifier [identification of the

destination field], text, or an attribute (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0037], lines 10-12).

Referring to claim 55, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein the first element [source portlet: i.e., Hotel portlet] comprises a

listening element [destination portlet: i.e., the field city in the Hotel portlet] registered to

receive a message from a particular element on the Web page [portlet on the portal

page: i.e., Airline Reservation portlet] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 56, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 55, wherein the first element [Hotel portlet] sends a message [city to the Car

Rental portlet] when it receives a message [destination city] from said particular element

[Airline Reservation portlet] (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031] and Fig 3B).

Referring to claim 57, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, wherein at least some of said listener elements have associated message

actions for sending messages to other elements (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0031] and Fig 3B

– i.e., when the Hotel portlet receives the destination city from the Airline Reservation

portlet, it then sends the city to the car rental portlet).

Referring to claim 58, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a computer-

readable medium having processor-executable instructions for performing the method

of claim 42 (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0010]).

Referring to claim 59, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses the method of

claim 42, further comprising: downloading a set of processor-executable instructions for

performing the method of claim 42 (Jerrard-Dunne: see [0010] and [0022]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   **Claims 5, 6, 26, 27 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al as applied

respectively to claims 4, 25 and 42 above, and further in view of Applicant's

Admitted Prior Art (hereafter AAPA).

Referring to claim 5, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a web page.

However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation

wherein the web page is implemented using a markup language. AAPA discloses how

web pages are typically defined, including the further limitation wherein the Web page is

implemented using a markup language (see [0010]) since a markup language allows a

document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to implement the web page of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy using a markup

language as disclosed by AAPA. One would have been motivated to do so since a

markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on

virtually any hardware.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy and

AAPA (hereafter Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy/AAPA) discloses the method of claim 5,

wherein the markup language comprises a selected one of HyperText Markup

Language (HTML), Extensible Markup Language (XML), Extensible Hypertext Markup

Language (XHTML), and Compact HyperText Markup Language (cHTML) (AAPA: see

[0010]).

Referring to claim 26, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a web page.

However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation

wherein the web page is implemented using a markup language. AAPA discloses how

web pages are typically defined, including the further limitation wherein the Web page is

implemented using a markup language (see [0010]) since a markup language allows a

document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to implement the web page of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy using a markup

language as disclosed by AAPA. One would have been motivated to do so since a

markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on

virtually any hardware.

Referring to claim 27, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy/AAPA discloses the method

of claim 5, wherein the markup language comprises a selected one of HyperText

Markup Language (HTML), Extensible Markup Language (XML), Extensible Hypertext

Markup Language (XHTML), and Compact HyperText Markup Language (cHTML)

(AAPA: see [0010]).

Referring to claim 45, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses displaying a portlet

in a portal page [Web page]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly

disclose the further limitation wherein the Web page comprises a markup language.

AAPA discloses how web pages are typically defined, including the further limitation

wherein an element [Web page comprising of portlets] is comprises a markup language

element (see [0010]) since a markup language allows a document with a complex

format to be viewed or printed on virtually any hardware.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to implement the web page of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy using a markup

language as disclosed by AAPA. One would have been motivated to do so since a

markup language allows a document with a complex format to be viewed or printed on

virtually any hardware.

9.   **Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 46, 47, 49, 50 and 53 are**

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub

2004/0090969 to Jerrard-Dunne et al as applied respectively to claims 1, 22 and 42

above, and further in view of US PGPub 2004/0199541 to Goldberg et al (hereafter Goldberg).

Referring to claim 7, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a first portlet [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first portlet comprises a markup language anchor. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the first portlet [reporting portlet] comprises a markup language anchor [at least one business result] (see [0051], lines 5-7 and Fig 4) since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a markup language anchor in a portlet as disclosed by Goldberg ass an added feature to the portlet of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do so since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user (Goldberg: see [0051], lines 9-15) and an anchor provides a solution to this problem by providing a link to underlying data.

Referring to claim 8, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses wherein said retrieving step includes retrieving a selected one of a Web page, a portion of a Web

page, database content, spreadsheet data, documents, files, and information [i.e., hotel

information] (see [0028], lines 5-11). However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to

explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the step of retrieving is from a Common

Gateway Interface. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being

simultaneously displayed within a browser window and a step of retrieving information

(see abstract), including the further limitation of retrieving information from a Common

Gateway Interface [internet gateway] (see [0041], lines 3-10) since a Common Gateway

Interface is a standard designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a Common Gateway Interface as disclosed by Goldberg to retrieve

information with the retrieving step disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One

would have been motivated to do so since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard

designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

Referring to claim 10, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a messaging

portlet [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose

the further limitation wherein said messaging portlet is structured as a HyperText

Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet

windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract),

including the further limitation wherein said messaging portlet [the portlet sends and

receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline

frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split

the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

Referring to claim 11, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a listener portlet [destination portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the listener portlet is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the listener portlet [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 15, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a messaging

portlet [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose

the further limitation wherein the messaging portlet is implemented using JavaScript.

Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within

a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said messaging

portlet is implemented using JavaScript (see [0042], lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses

JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and presentation functionalities

described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web authors to embed

programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy in the form of

JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since

JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML

text of web pages.

Referring to claim 16, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a messaging

portlet [source portlet] sending a message to a listener portlet [destination portlet].

However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation

wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message. Goldberg discloses a plurality

of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see

abstract), including the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast

message (see [0042], lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business

data communication and presentation functionalities described in the invention) since

JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML

text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy in the form of

JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since

JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML

text of web pages.

Referring to claim 28, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses an actioner

module [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly

disclose the further limitation wherein the actioner module comprises a markup

language anchor. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being

simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further

limitation wherein the actioner module [reporting portlet] comprises a markup language

anchor [at least one business result] (see [0051], lines 5-7 and Fig 4) since the

developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a high enough level of

abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance, while also being at a

low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a markup language anchor in a portlet as disclosed by Goldberg ass an

added feature to the portlet of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been

motivated to do so since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a

high enough level of abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance,

while also being at a low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user

(Goldberg: see [0051], lines 9-15) and an anchor provides a solution to this problem by

providing a link to underlying data.

Referring to claim 29, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses wherein at least

one listener module retrieves a selected one of a Web page, a portion of a Web page,

database content, spreadsheet data, documents, files, and information [i.e., hotel

information] (see [0028], lines 5-11). However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to

explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the step of retrieving is from a Common

Gateway Interface. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being

simultaneously displayed within a browser window and a step of retrieving information

(see abstract), including the further limitation of retrieving information from a Common

Gateway Interface [internet gateway] (see [0041], lines 3-10) since a Common Gateway

Interface is a standard designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a Common Gateway Interface as disclosed by Goldberg to retrieve

information with the retrieving step disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One

would have been motivated to do so since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard

designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

Referring to claim 31, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses an actioner

module [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly

disclose the further limitation wherein said actioner module is structured as a HyperText

Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet

windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract),

including the further limitation wherein said actioner module [the portlet sends and

receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline

frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split

the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e.,

interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do

so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 32, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses at least one

listener module [destination portlets]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to

explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said at least one listener module is

structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses

a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window

(see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said at least one listener module [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

Referring to claim 36, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses an actioner module [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said actioner module is implemented using JavaScript. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said actioner module is implemented using JavaScript (see [0042], lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy in the form of

JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

Referring to claim 37, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses an actioner module [source portlet] sending a message in response to user interaction. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message (see [0042], lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy in the form of JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

Referring to claim 46, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a first element [source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first element comprises a markup language anchor. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within

a browser window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the first

element [reporting portlet] comprises a markup language anchor [at least one business

result] (see [0051], lines 5-7 and Fig 4) since the developer aims to provide a portlet that

displays data at a high enough level of abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user

in a single glance, while also being at a low enough level of abstraction so as to be

actionable by the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a markup language anchor in a portlet as disclosed by Goldberg ass an

added feature to the portlet of Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been

motivated to do so since the developer aims to provide a portlet that displays data at a

high enough level of abstraction to be readily appreciated by the user in a single glance,

while also being at a low enough level of abstraction so as to be actionable by the user

(Goldberg: see [0051], lines 9-15) and an anchor provides a solution to this problem by

providing a link to underlying data.

Referring to claim 47, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses wherein said

displaying step includes displaying a selected one of a Web page, a portion of a Web

page, database content, spreadsheet data, documents, files, and information [i.e., hotel

information] (see [0028], lines 5-11). However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to

explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the step of displaying is from a Common

Gateway Interface. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being

simultaneously displayed within a browser window and a step of retrieving information

(see abstract), including the further limitation of retrieving information from a Common

Gateway Interface [internet gateway] (see [0041], lines 3-10) since a Common Gateway

Interface is a standard designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use a Common Gateway Interface as disclosed by Goldberg to display

information with the displaying step disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One

would have been motivated to do so since a Common Gateway Interface is a standard

designed in order to extend the functionality of the servers.

Referring to claim 49, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a first element

[source portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the

further limitation wherein said first element is structured as a HyperText Markup

Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows being

simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the further

limitation wherein said first element [the portlet sends and receives messages] is

structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053])

structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do

so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 50, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses at least one

collaborative element [destination portlet]. However, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy fails

to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein said at least one collaborative element

is structured as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame. Goldberg

discloses a plurality of portlet windows being simultaneously displayed within a browser

window (see abstract), including the further limitation wherein said at least one

collaborative element [the portlet sends and receives messages] is structured as a

HyperText Markup Language (HTML) inline frame [iFrame] (see [0053]) structuring the

portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into separate sections

[portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with) independently.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use HTML inline frames as disclosed by Goldberg to frame each of the

portlets defined by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy. One would have been motivated to do

so since structuring the portlets in frames provides the ability to split the portal page into

separate sections [portlets], each of which can then be scrolled (i.e., interacted with)

independently.

Referring to claim 53, Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy discloses a first element

[source portlet] sending a message in response to user interaction. However, Jerrard-

Dunne/Ramaswamy fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the message

is a javaScript broadcast message. Goldberg discloses a plurality of portlet windows

being simultaneously displayed within a browser window (see abstract), including the

further limitation wherein the message is a javaScript broadcast message (see [0042],

lines 1-15 – Goldberg uses JavaScript to achieve the business data communication and

presentation functionalities described in the invention) since JavaScript enables web

authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML text of web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to send the message disclosed by Jerrard-Dunne/Ramaswamy in the form of

JavaScript as disclosed by Goldberg. One would have been motivated to do so since

JavaScript enables web authors to embed programming instructions within the HTML

text of web pages.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

18 May 2007
kml

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100